



Collaboration Corvallis PARKING AND TRAFFIC



MINUTES

DATE	April 29, 2013
FACILITATOR(S)	Steve Clark
MINUTES TAKEN BY	Digital Recording/ Transcribed by Vanessa Kanekeberg
ATTENDEES	Matt Palm, Eric Adams, Rainier Farmer, Gary Angelo, Courtney Cloyd, Steve Clark, Brandon Trelstad, Ken Gibb, Stan Nudelman
GUEST SPEAKERS	Mary Steckel – City of Public Works Rebecca Houghtaling – OSU, Senior Planner
VISITORS OF THE COMMUNITY	Randy Chakerian

INTRODUCTIONS

Ken Gibb – City Staff, Collaboration Project
Rainier Farmer – OSU, Alternative Transportation
Brandon Trelstad – OSU, Sustainability Coordinator
Courtney Cloyd – Central Park Neighborhood Association
Stan Nudelman
Matt Palm – OSU, Graduate Student
Steve Clark – OSU, VP University Relations
Gary Angelo – College Hill Neighborhood Assoc.
Eric Adams – Project Manager
Hank Kemper-OSU, Transit & Parking Services
Jeff Davidson – Benton Community College
Mary Steckel – City of Public Works
Rebecca Houghtaling – OSU, Senior Planner

Comment: I wanted to make sure you are aware of some issues. I live in the Harding neighborhood which is 29th to 36th, Harrison to Grant so the northwest corner of the College Hill neighborhood. The two issues that I have are in the context of about 2000 bedrooms coming on a line within the next year that the Harrison street apartments that Tyler occupied but then Campus Crest to the west of Harrison and also southern, because even though the southern is in the northwest corner those kids are not going to stay down there, they are going to be coming north on 35th coming down Harrison, 36th where ever. So that's the general context I have—the two things are—please don't be overly OSU centric in the deliberations and looking over the makeup of the committee the majority of you are from OSU. I think when you were doing your

parking district stuff that was fine—traffic coming into the parking districts in your OSU neighborhoods to park, but traffic is all over the City, it's not OSU centric not too and from OSU. These kids go everywhere you see it the first couple of weeks of every quarter for just all over the City. So please try and take off the OSU if you can. The other thing is I don't know anything about traffic management so I looked it up on Google and what I found was they say demand management means different things to different distant ones, information technology specialist think of new technology applied information operation as managers think its managing demand, controlling flawed highways. I think it's pricing to find equilibrium, markers think its promoting innovative campaigns and many policy makers think it mean, well they don't know what it means. What I would ask you is with these 2000 new bedrooms coming on line I don't think that's something the client commission can take into its program, but the cumulative effect of that if you could possibly do that and make some cases for that issue that the impact for those 2000 bedrooms for to the west and north of OSU I think you would be doing the City a great service.

Comment: We're all doing our best and we all live in Corvallis so we understand your point of location. We will work as a community to address all that.

Presentation from Corvallis Public Works

Comment (Mary Steckel): My role and my department's role in participating in the planning process but we are the ones that then implement the plan that comes out of the planning effort. So you probably are all aware of this, but I just wanted to start with some general overview information so we are on the same page as far as Corvallis is concerned that basically with the transportation system plan that we are trying to create a circulation system through our community to efficiently move goods, services and people by a variety of modes, it's not just focused on automobile. The current transportation system plans was last updated in 1996—coming up to be almost 20 years old. It's goals were to promote the safe and efficient movement of people and goods—to promote alternative modes of transportation—and to design and enhance quality of neighborhoods, so keeping that local component of local streets and that neighborhoods have a character that we want to maintain. With any plan there are potentially competing issues that need to be addressed that need to be balanced and primarily for transportation planning for Corvallis; primary protection, mobility within the City, enhance economic environment and vitality and then of course the livability of our neighborhoods. Sometimes those are in concerts or competition, but the goal of the plan is to carefully balance those issues for the community wide outcomes. It's a plan that should provide consistent application for policy makers—so clear direction on what we're supporting and what we're trying to do and of course it means to be coordinated with other local jurisdictions—in this case OSU, ODOT, Linn county, Benton county—those are all important players in transportation movement throughout that greater region. Overarching is the state planning rule which sets some clear criteria for transportation planning in the community it requires us develop system plans for the automobile, bike, pedestrian and transit. It also sets some specific actions for reviewing development proposals coming into our development services staff to ensure compliance with requirements depending on the kind of development that would be required for bike parking, pedestrian bike movement, and circulation and transit systems—so those are our overarching requirements in which we have to provide transportation services. Like I said the plan was last updated 1996, 2 years later a transportation alternative analysis was completed. It's my experience that in the realm of transportation there are more planning efforts with different titles that doesn't exist in waste water utilities, store water utilities—there's a ton in transportation so don't feel lost if you get lost because there is a bunch. Basically what the transportation alternative modes did was look to reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles and basically to try to maximize the current capacity of the street system to extend its life as far as

possible so we weren't creating new load ways trying to deal with congestion in different ways. In order to do that two other efforts were looked at—transportation demand management which was talked about earlier—which is basically the desire to reduce peak hour traffic, reduce that congestion. One easily way to understand and do that is understand and encourage alternative modes, the more people you get out of cars the less congestion that you have. Then the other part would be transportation system management which is one of those bouncing acts because system management is to make sure you've got efficient smooth transportation so things are moving quickly and efficiently through the system without using cut through traffic, that kind of thing. One way to do that is to coordinate traffic signals for instance, so in through the downtown area if you go at a certain speed you can roll through all those traffic signals in an efficient manner. So basically all those planning efforts has set the direction for transportation planning what we have been doing for the last 16-18 years. That's been focusing on increasing bike and pedestrian facilities, improving transit services and frequency, reliability, promoting and strategizing to reduce peak hours of traffic—all those things came out of those efforts. Our current goal is to update the Corvallis transportation plan and getting it in fiscal year 2014/15, so a couple years out. Frankly it's a matter of funding we do not have the resources within our current funding streams to take on a multi hundred thousand dollar planning effort and we just don't have it so we have to rely on grant funds. We have submitted a grant for the ODOT TGM program which is a transportation growth management. If we are successful in the grant we will expect to start being able to spend those funds July 2014 which will correspond directly with what we're trying and plan to do. Quite frankly if we are not successful in that granting cycle we will continue to apply, but we will not be able to move forward on a comprehensive transportation plan until we have the funding in place. In addition to the City of Corvallis efforts, there are several efforts that the MPO the metropolitan plan organization is undertaking—it's basically a designation set for communities that are 50,000 or greater and allows you to do more planning on a regional basis than just a municipal basis and for Corvallis the MPO is roughly Adair Village through Corvallis to Philomath and other parts of the county that are in between that, so our MPO in the next year is going to be looking at a transportation safety plan. We will be looking at accident and other kind of data to determine intersections that might benefit from some mitigation for safety. They will do a travel demand forecast model update which is good for us because forecasting where the travel demand is will update really nicely with the update to our transportation system plan when we get to that point. They will be using the 2010 data and in fact that has already started, then they will take that MPO travel demand data and fold it into a larger regional travel picture which is roughly Lebanon, Albany, Philomath and Corvallis. There is a lot of trips that go between those community's for commuting and services for a larger regional basis. My favorite part of that project is that it is called calm and it stands for Corvallis, Albany, Lebanon and Millersburg I think. So that is roughly the information I had to share and to the extent that I can answer questions I'd be happy to or if you want to wait until after.

Comment: Let's hear from Rebecca and then we will have questions for the both of you.

Presentation from OSU Campus Planning

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): I created a handout for all of you, some of this may be a review. I have been with the University for about 2 years and one of the things that when I was interviewing they said we are really excited because I have a background in transportation planning and that is something they really need. We are albeit, while we do not have what I would consider a strong multi global transportation plan we are doing a lot of transportation planning at the University. We annually do a subtle efforts transportation model which is a requirement through the City of Corvallis through our campus master plan. Unfortunately it is predominately or basically entirely vehicular so the current model does not incorporate pedestrians into the

model which obviously in our campus is a huge factor in something we recognize and our looking to update with the new model in the coming year. We do an annual parking utilization study and we do a bicycle utilization study every other year to assess both the capacity and the utilization of those facilities on campus. We are currently in the process of the sector C circulation plan, this project evolved out of concerns by our staff with regard to safe access in the southeast quadrant of sector C so basically Washington Way, 15th street, Jefferson, all the way over to 16th street. It was furred on by a couple of projects on campus and staff was kind of scratching on how it was going. We have some issues and we need to resolve these so we are working on developing some long term plans on how to address some of the pedestrian, bicycle and parking issues in and around—Goss stadium really is the center and then looking at the area in transportation. So we are looking at the process this week of having our next public meeting of getting feedback. I am looking forward to hearing comments from some of the key committees on campus and getting their thoughts on that. Washington Way as I am sure most of you are familiar with the University's effort to redesign Washington Way from 35th street all the way to 11th, 10th street, it will implemented through phases but we are getting close to final design. The challenge has been the railroads are hard to work with, so the next project is the OSU street standards. This has been an ongoing project with regard to the land development code as most of you are aware University transportation and traffic is very different than a lot of the other areas of Corvallis with regard to just the numbers of pedestrians that were going through our facilities at the top of the hour the change of the clock, so looking at how our sidewalks relate to streets current code does not allow for us in the OSU zone to have curbside sidewalks, we have underground tunnels which are basically so cost prohibited to move that it is not a bi-law option to move the tunnels so we can't necessarily meet existing code by having the planting strip between the curb and the sidewalk and we also having the OSU national historical district there is ramifications and so we are looking at preparing a text amendment so that we can adjust the dimensional standards so we can adjust these OSU zones specifically to allow for safe pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular transportation—but in a way that makes sense within a University setting and we have been working closely with City staff on that. And then last year we had two projects that looked at and had aspects of transportation planning, both the northeast quadrant master plan which is really a long term vision—kind of like a neighborhood plan if you will for sector C and D so the majority of campus where you think of the core for students going to classes and then looking at the eastern end of campus and looking at the long term vision. One of the things that came out of that was nothing we really weren't surprised to see but the need to maintain multi-pads, so not just looking at vehicular transportation but also looking at pedestrians and bikes. And then number 8 was really a key initiative for work on campus which is the pedestrian facilities, ADA assessment—obviously it is a high priority at OSU and one of the things that we realized is that having a safe path of travel. We have some challenges with our existing grades as well as our facilities and so we need to upgrade and prioritize those. The other ones, moving backwards some planning efforts we do have concept plans for some of our streets but it is not a holistic approach and that's the one thing that staff really recognizes is that while we've been doing a lot of work in this area it's all individual projects—it's looking at bikes, it's looking at cars, it's looking at different things in isolation and looking at the gap and the reason why we are feeling really strongly about—with the campus master plan update over the next couple of years is the need for a multi-modal transportation plan—that really takes a larger view and brings in together how these things fit. To that end, we do not also have funding for that component yet and we recognize the need for getting key consultants involved to help us do this in a way that not only makes sense for the University but as the University relates to the study for Corvallis. So under the future transportation planning efforts as I said the multi-modal transportation plan, one of the things that we are also currently involved is we've had meetings with ODOT, Campo and City staff to discuss the development

of a transportation model that ODOT campaigning but the interesting thing is they are developing a model but it is based on the U of O data, so while it's going to be more representative of a University that is not in the metro area—because right now if you think about how the model's work for University's it's based on PSU data. So Portland state is so different with regard to how it fits into Portland as how U of O fits into Eugene or OSU into Corvallis just because the size and the scale of the other drivers with regard to transportation. So it is a step in the right direction and we've had discussions about that, however if Eugene is still different than Corvallis and so if it's something that we are moving with steps in the right direction and I am optimistic about it—but it's something I am excited just to have had conversations with all of these entities in the same room and trying to come to terms and develop a model that will make sense for all of us and each group can feel confident because that's going to help us have conversations about projections in the future, transportation planning initiatives. So with regard to the challenges that we see at OSU to transportation planning in addition to the cost of not only planning initiatives but also the implantation and infrastructure cost. The first question is really defining the goals for campus transportation planning because often times when you think of transportation planning you have to think of what facilities are you planning for because how you define efficiency really is based on the type of facilities that you're thinking. If it's a local street, efficiency is different than if you're looking at I-5, so the question in starting our discussions and looking at future planning at OSU is how we define efficiency on campus. Is it quickly moving cars through campus, is it quickly moving bikes through campus, is it quickly moving pedestrians through campus with transit or shuttles? I mean maybe quickly isn't the word that we are looking for and really that is the starting point is understanding how can we envision the transportation system working, what are our priorities, how do we want it to be, what is the relationship of the different modes? I also kind of just listed out some other things, regulations and engineering standards, I frequently get calls that say, could we do this and I have to sometimes explain that you need certain traffic volumes to warrant different changes and they start to say I sound like I am an engineer and I am not I am just trying to translate for you—there are certain things that common sense would say, well couldn't we do this, and you can say well say we could under these conditions. So it is just something to think through that there are different regulations—I got a call from Vet med and they said can we get signage out on the approach from I-5 to let people know that their horse trailer is not to go over the bridge but to turn south and come around over the bypass and I said, David and I both talked and were like we would love to help you but—and there is regulations with regard to ODOT and the City in different things with regard to defining a hospital and a vet hospital doesn't classify, we can't get signage for Benton hospitals out in those locations—so there's certain things that while we think would make sense it just kind of depends on your point of view and so there's just standards. As I said the railroad is a challenge, it is a really interesting situation when you think about a University of our size having a railroad go through the University and have as much frequency as it does, it's kind of a unique situation and it's both a challenge and a blessing. Bonding regulations, this has been the biggest challenge I think of over the last two years for OSU, I think with regard to funding parking and transportation and that's the way the bonding has been written and the regulation that where we can and can't spend money—and this is, in my opinion the biggest challenge that we have to overcome with regard to OUS and the City of Corvallis and being able to say we as the University can meet our local obligations in a way that is within the confines within the funding regulations. The other fun ones, campus and the community stakeholders, we have a lot of different stakeholders on campus and that's one of the reasons why with the sector C project I talked to David Dodson and said I want to get the parking committee, the alternative transportation committee, the AUAC and the campus planning committee all in the same room—and he is like, are you sure you want to do that and I said yes, because unless we are all in the same room the different people are not going to hear the needs of the

groups on campus and the other stakeholders. Even though Oregon State sometimes seems like it's the University and the others, the City of Corvallis, it's so diverse in the needs whether it's, we have the Roxy group, Kid Spirit, people bringing their small children and they need short term parking—it's such a diverse University where there's a lot of stakeholders defining what their transportation planning means are and it's going to be a real challenge as we move forward. I thought it was interesting as I was preparing for this that I provided a quote from the 2005 campus master plan that I thought, unfortunately was still very relevant 8 years later. In that funding the state legislature has not been adequate to maintain campus facilities and has resulted in deferred maintenance problems at OSU. Additional transportation improvement projects from the state is not likely to be appropriate, I don't think that's changed. So I think we need to come up with realistic and implementable solutions so that we don't disappoint not only the people at the University but more importantly we don't disappoint the community members. My last comment is, and it's something that Mary and I think it's also really exciting is looking at regional planning and the fact that we have a metropolitan planning organization, because as I think when we are really realistic a lot of the University draws traffic and draws people in from all over the region, whether it's from Eugene, whether it's from Lebanon, whether it's from Albany, Philomath and I think looking at solving a lot of our transportation planning starts in Corvallis but spreads out.

Question: So Mary, Rebecca, let me offer a little bit of context and then Mary ask you her question or answer to one overarching and then let's open up questions from the committee. The context as you both know for the last 14 months the work groups have been meeting and hopefully a lot of views were holistic, hopefully in a holistic and an additive way of creating a strategy that hopefully singular recommendations add to a cumulative effect. We've addressed transit recommendations and parking recommendations and we are now imagining traffic as our next area will endeavor while maintaining a close eye on parking management whether it is off campus could benefit both the University and possibly the neighborhoods, traffic demand management, safety and that's something our transportation system, not just highways but the pathways and the ability of festering some bicyclist and even skateboarders like Courtney and Gary to get around—and then to have a series of metrics, so it's both of you have created an area while we may not have the expertise or the ability to write a check, we might enroll on recommendations coming from the price—and how do we prioritize those for our metrics but also how do we prioritize those by identification of some of the range of funding and plus even by calling out priority we might actually raise the specter of if you will a responsibly to identify funding sources, not necessarily identifying with ourselves what those funding sources are but just elevating the priority. It would help Mary, I guess the question was could you outline over the next 12 to 18 months, maybe 0 to 18 months traffic improvements, either road or interchange, which I realize are related, but that are occurring in the collaboration project boundaries, besides the traffic circles in downtown Corvallis that maybe on the horizon that folks would have a sense of what's coming to mind, what are some of those?

Response (Mary): I am not sure I know off the top of my head of any projects that are in the project 15th, the grind and inlay—it's a re-servicing project, it's not like a change to traffic patterns or adding capacity with a turn lane or anything in that capacity.

Comment (Rebecca): I think the only ones—Washington Way between 26th and 15th and then there's a little bit at 15th and Washington.

Question: Within the project area, Harrison or anticipated with Sather, any other improvements at nearby intersections associated with those projects?

Response: I think there's probably some turn lanes associated with Sather.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): Isn't there, I believe we have the—we're going to be addressing things with pedestrians and bicycle lanes south of the railroad track, on both sides of the street with the southern project.

Comment: There will also be improvements at 35th and the railroad crossing, with improved bike path, pedestrian and facilities through that area where that railroad crossing is.

Comment: There may be some more associated with development projects, that's something our staff could summarize in terms of recent development projects and then corresponding transportation improvements associated with them. But there'd be more of a minor level versus major expansion.

Comment: And I think there's a difference between ones we have funding for and the one we would like to be doing or could be doing or should be doing.

Comment: I understand that and particularly around the three major developments if there were permit requirements that were associated with the developer or paid for.

Comment: I think we can come back and enumerate those for the committee.

Question (Gary Angelo): Okay, questions for each, first Rebecca on the Washington Way, could you explain what the plan changes on that are and also is the funding already secure?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): So Washington Way is a collector, so between 35th and basically 11th—so the project was originally started or triggered by the student legacy park which because it was adjacent to the street it triggered the improvements and so there was MAOA sign that postponed it and the University hasn't held funds and we hit the big bonding challenge with regard to spending of the money and the City has been very patient with us and worked very closely with us. So basically with the new student resident project, it basically triggered the 15th and Washington is a failing intersection. So currently Washington Way is actually in the railroad right of way and so—and it is an undersized facility and so it doesn't have bike lanes and it doesn't meet the collector standards. So what OSU is having to do is actually shift the street to the north to get out of the railroad right of way, have to increase it by at least 12 feet to the travel lanes to get by the bike lanes within the curb to curb. Then also we are having to demolish 4 buildings on the east end, between Benton place and 15th—4 building will be coming down to re-due that intersection and get the slight lines. Then we will also be putting a new sidewalk on the north side, there will not be a sidewalk on the south side.

Question (Gary Angelo): And there will still be just a one lane infrastructure?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): Yes, it will one lane in each direction. And so it's going to be done in phases because we don't have the money to do all of it-- I believe the phasing is done, basically Benton place to the intersection at 15th is the first phase, and then the second phase is between 30th and 26th and then the far west portion between 35th and 30th will be triggered by future development. So it's going to be interesting.

Question (Gary Angelo): Mary, just clarity on something you said in the beginning—you said, it almost sounded like you're public works is the implementation organization for the transportation plan but you're not the creators of it or you're not the owners—what process steps and who are the players who are actually pulling it through to creation through approval?

Response (Mary): I just want to start by saying I have not been to obviously the transportation planning process before since the last time was before in 96, but I think it's a situation where between planning and public works we're working collaboratively to bring the process together but the truth is I am going to be hiring a

consultant to come in and help us do not just the planning but also the public outreach and the efforts we would do there. So as far as the steps I don't know if that's...

Comment (Ken Gibb): The players, again predate in my time actually working on it—the last effort that had public works as a joint effort doing public works and community development from a project management standpoint. It would be amendment to a comprehensive plan and it would go up for public hearings at the planning commission and City Council level. So what we did last time is the transportation plan came before the comprehensive plan update last time and it looks like it may happen that way this time just the way it's working—but certainly the concepts in the transportation plan were carried forward into the comprehensive plan relative to conductivity of any other kind of key elements of it. It would be a holistic project not just done in a public works engineering environment, it would be a community environment. And with the University, I think that's the other player that maybe was not at the table in the early 90's or maybe mid 90's really strongly—think it's a different day and age and I think the university certainly would need to be more relevant to this update than it was last night.

Question (Courtney Cloyd): So the first time would come before the—the public would be in the planning stage?

Response (Ken Gibb): No it would be a community engagement process throughout, and again in our planning history here it's going to be citizens, community holders and stakeholders involved throughout the process.

The official part—if we aren't in good shape by the time we get to the commission we're in trouble, frankly.

Comment (Courtney Cloyd): You should have a working draft by the time you get to the planning committee

Comment (Gary Angelo): Oh absolutely, it step along the way.

Question (Courtney Cloyd): Point of clarification, what's the different between a resident and a stakeholder in your mind?

Response (Ken Gibb): Well I think the University is a stakeholder as an institution and people who live in the community are involved so I look at it without thinking when you look at the stakeholder and resident's you'd have neighborhood groups involved, intuitional, business interest represented from a transportation standpoint—again it's not just how it effects individual residential areas but it's all goods and services for the community and the economy in the community.

Comment (Mary): And I would just add to that that even in the last plan Benton County was a huge stakeholder with the planning process so as their residence interact with the municipality and how they get around to get services from the community as well.

Comment (Ken Gibb): And I think the last time around we didn't have the benefit of a metropolitan planning organization where we had a more regional approach to transportation planning that we do now.

Question (Courtney Cloyd): Who is representing the state on that?

Response (Mary): Benton County, City of Corvallis, City of Philomath, City of Adair Village and all elected officials from those 4 communities—and then there's an ex-official from ODOT both planning and regular operations folks.

Comment (Ken Gibb): And there is a technical committee and that's again called for in the federal regs to both have a policy committee and a technical committee associated.

Comment (Mary): That's a good point I was just giving you the makeup of the policy committee, the ones that run and set the direction, than the technical committee recommends process changes over projects or funding in that, and that's all staff.

Question: I just have a general question, we do have a number of members of this group here who are not affiliated with the University and so in a sense we are a fairly holistic group when we do represent a number of different parts of Corvallis and the Community. How can this committee help you all to do your job and in other words what can we do to help you, is there anything and how do you see us playing a role in that?

Response (Mary): Well from my perspective, you guys did an amazing job on the parking district and I think through a lot of hard work and detail analysis. Quite frankly I don't want you to duplicate that level of effort in this process because we need to go through the community wide transportation plan, it needs to be in a larger context. So if you folks were to do a mini project planning right now just focused on the campus area, it's only going to have value in how it folds into the larger community wide picture. So I think from my perspective what would be valuable is we need to find out from all sectors in the community what they consider the hot spots are, what do they consider the areas that we need to be focusing on, what are the concerns. So to the extent that your group can bring those issues forward that would be sure to address as we moved into a more comprehensive planning process that would be very valuable.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): I put it up slightly differently in the sense of it's a little bit of a different perspective because OSU is smack dab in the middle of the area with which you are looking but we bring people in from all over. I mean I think of just in my group in the things I hear about and talking about transportation and planning and yet when I am walking around campus the things that concern about the most is the safety issues and I think that some often times when it comes down to making difficult choices—we all talked about the fact that funding is clearly a challenge. The hard part is that people don't like to fund transportation and infrastructure project because they are not glamorous it not like, oh look here is the sewer I just replaced , or what you can't see—you know or here is the street, but what concerns me the most walking around campus are the safety concerns. It's when you walk down Jefferson and you go up the hill so when you're headed west past Snell on the south side when you're walking up the hill you past the beautiful library and you see these huge semis dropping stuff off at the MU and they're taking two little boxes out, and you have bicyclist and you have people in wheelchairs and you have people walking all over the place and we have so many concerns and you look at the streets and what's happening in the infrastructure—I know where the tunnels are and they are not structurally loaded—and you know how many time I see a car parked on the tunnels, these things are what concern me, it's the transportation, it's when you walk on Benton place and you see people biking the wrong way, you see people backing out, you see people doing all these things and I don't think you guys can solve all these problems but I think you have the power to articulate the need for finding real solutions that bring together the ADA community, the alternative transportation committee, the community, and really as I said in the beginning, defining what successful transportation systems mean—because I think it is really different in a University setting and it is in a small town or a downtown or a highway—but I think we have to define it as a community and I think we have to make sure at the end of the day things are safe.

Question: Help me understand a little bit more of why you think it's different on a University campus from you say the downtown City of Corvallis?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): Because I think the volume and I think the rate of speed at which you want people going through campus, driving through campus is different than the rate of speed you want people driving through say third street and even going through at 25 is different than the rate of speed I would want going through campus.

Question: And that's because?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): That's because so many more pedestrians and response times I think we need to have people moving slower, I think we want a campus where you keep deliveries and people to the outside

because we have so many people walking and biking and those kinds of things that it's just safer to have—it's a different system.

Comment: I would add to that, because of your bell times you have this massive flux of people that come out in that 10 minutes then essentially disappear and then come out again and disappear. So just the usage of the system is dramatically different than say what we would be planning for in this neighborhood and say well peak usage in the morning when people come to drop off their kids at school then go to their work then peak usage in the afternoon when they are coming back, we have two major fluxes than kind of regular traffic throughout the day in most parts of town but on campus I mean there is a lot of people moving through buildings quickly is a small period of time so just the usage is so dramatically different.

Comment: I would add to that. It's the difference between one person jays walking and really thought friends visit this campus and be like it's like a video where they are trying not to kill anyone.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): And I think timing is a big factor and looking at policy and changes—when do things happen and looking at functionality and that kind of thing.

Comment: Input, questions.

Question: I guess I have a question about whether or not campus related improvements let's say to transportation will involve any changes or what I would consider improvements to street parking signage so that those who feel compelled to drive to campus for whatever reason can do so more efficiently because you don't know campus very well and the percentage of the population is—I've heard stories about people having to circle around because one they don't know where the parking lots are and I realize that's a changing scenario as you building more parking lots but—there's that and sometimes it's hard to find signs if you don't what street your on—like I said not everybody knows the campus but they find themselves driving on campus from time to time, have you thought about that at all?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): We have, actually working with the City right now to get some signage for the parking deck and working with staff to look at getting some signage on Western, which would be in the City's right of way to provide directions and staff has said that they are willing to work thought is one. And then also getting some signage on 26th street and some other locations to help people know where they are going because there are some signs now but you can't see them, they are small and white and not the big blue parking directional signage. Signage is something that I have learned on campus is one of these Pandora's boxes because you have to be careful how you sign, but it's something that staff has been talking about is park of—one of our to do list is to look at re-visiting signs on campus—currently there is a sign exemption area within the land development code so it doesn't actually represent all of campus so it's something that we would have to work with the City on to develop, we do have a sign plan but it is very limited.

Question: The upcoming transportation plan on campus, do you see that exploring the idea of reducing vehicular traffic on campus—reducing the number of streets that are available?

Question: Reducing streets?

Response: Well just reducing vehicular access to campus in light of the fact that you get so much pedestrian traffic and the idea that I walk where I want whenever I want. Maybe the safest way to do that is just to make it a no drive zone or make more of campus a no drive zone.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): There's already a framework for that within the campus master plan or an idea for creating a more pedestrian dominated campus and a lot of our planning documents do call for really focusing and highlighting the pedestrian corridors over the vehicular. The big challenge of that is something

we are going to have to work through is what about deliveries, what about UPS, what about food service, what about ADA accessibility and transit, what about bicycle routes—and so it's not off the table it's defiantly something we're considering, we are right at the beginning of it so everything would be open for re-discussion and looking through.

Comment: Other questions?

Question: The subject of safer came up and having just reviewed the latest plans for Serr? Project, it's come to my attention that at least at this point there is no provision in their plan for creating pedestrian bike access across 35th to easily access the east west throughway and if that's the case I'd like to see something change—I don't know what that process would be but if the only way students can get across 35th is by the main access point between 35th and the project or going down to Western and going that way which is less efficient than going further north and getting along the connector, that's a concern. So I would like to raise that so that you are aware of it.

Question (Rainier Farmer): So kind of a process question and Rebecca you kind of highlighted under the future transportation planning efforts coordination between ODOT, CAMPO, Corvallis and OSU and I guess I'm still not quite clear about what that looks like and Mary indicated that on the Corvallis side it is funding dependent so I guess what's that coordination really looking like with the ODOT and University?

Response (Rebecca Houghtaling): So currently OSU has our own transportation base model so we just run our model annually and we take CAMPO data and it's background data but there's questions—but it's different there is our model then there's the CAMPO model and then there's this whole idea that ODOT is developing a University model with a lower U based on Eugene data that's different than the current model that they have that's based on the PSU data. So the modeling efforts is really working with ODOT, City staff and CAMPO and the University working to develop the idea that there would be one model that we would all be running the same model so that we're more confident in the data and less questioning the outcomes of the model.

Question: Who in ODOT is taking the lead on that?

Response: It's out of the Salem office.

Question: So if I may, relate it to funding and priority—so say Corvallis has systems that charge for transportation; \$2500 for a single family home and then there's a charge for commercial based upon square footage say some sum of money, is the priority utilization of those funds, the systems development charge, is the utilization for those funds used for existing maintenance, the impacts of growth, both or...?

Response (Mary): Well the systems development charge need to be used for increasing capacity, so it wouldn't be for ongoing maintenance, it wouldn't be for grind inlays, it wouldn't be for anything like that. So it has to be for putting in a right turn lane in for where one didn't exist before or putting in traffic signals in where one didn't exist before or a traffic circle. So it's for capacity enhancing projects—but you don't have to say we're going to put this on—like you could do a capacity improvement on 35th on Grant and I am just making this up—but it doesn't have to be associated with any particular development.

Question: So what I am trying to get a sense of is are the system development charges that have been collected late, let's say in the last 5 to 10 years—have they been sufficient to support the improvements to the system that have been required by the growth that has occurred in Corvallis?

Response: I need to clarify something, there is two ways to pay for improvements other than general funds,-- one is through the ecstasies which are dedicated for extra capacity, and two is the developer responsibilities for specific improvements associated with a particular development project.

Comment (Mary): So we are collecting ecstasies for a long list of projects that we assume are going to happen over some planning period and to the simple answer to your question is there has been sufficient funds in the ecstasies fund component to pay for everything to need to have happened up to this point.

Question: So if we have a shortfall in house bill 2001 and trying to address that in many ways as the 2009 legislation would increase the effect and so forth. However mileage has been dropping and fuel efficiencies have been increasing but it hasn't probably provided the City of Corvallis and county's sufficient funds to maintain the system we already have—but as associated with growth generally speaking the City of Corvallis has the financial capacity to address expanding transportation capacity requirements but not sufficient funds to maintain the system we presently have. So we have certainly enough funding available here for growth, and some of that is paid for by the University, some of that is by commercial or industrial within the Corvallis City limits or specific developments, Harrison street or southern way and so forth. We don't have the ability to maintain the system, similarly the University has about an 800 million dollar liability for maintenance and buildings, 100 year old or 50 year old campus and the City presently doesn't have the ability to fund transportation planning because we don't have the funds. It would cost approximately how much to do that update?

Response (Mary): A complete transportation plan update would be \$300,000.

Question: Okay, so the committee may be able to weigh in to imagine to be—because transportation is rather holistic to look at the broad area. But if we looked at the specifics, we could for example suggest that while we have the funding to be X, we don't have the ability to plan for it or we don't have the ability to maintain. So it could be that the committee might want to evaluate what is really skimming the state of Oregon for decades which is transportation maintenance. It could be that at least the City's concern we may recommend that there needs to be an emphasis on connective planning so that land use, pedestrian safety, bicycle safety and transportation safety including the issues that we talked about several weeks ago or made a priority that's part of a strategy and not let strategy wait for beyond 2014 to address because growth is ongoing—can STC's help pay for transportation plan update, are they specifically related to capacity improvements—versus plan or the work—can STC's pay for any part of the planning update?

Question: I think we've taken the position, no that isn't in the past that it has to be tied to the specific planning and engineering with those projects versus a general community plan.

Comment (Mary): Well I think that would also say, I am not 100% sure on the regulations from a state level about STC's—but I think we say that when we have our plan for what we are going to get or what we're going to charge each resident for STC's to fund that long list of projects, transportation planning is not one of them. So we would have to incorporate that and start...

Comment: I know that STC's are guided by state law.

Comment (Mary): There are regulations and I think to just add to that which is an important point that even if we had the money to do the planning Rebecca talked about that's really just baby step one of 100 step process—which is all the improvements that are recommended from that plan then have to be funded and implemented.

Comment: By the time you start the plan, or 18 years removed from the most original plan created...

Comment (Mary): I mean there are still projects in that plan that have not been constructed.

Question: Can the metropolitan planning organization provide funds too?

Response: They have a funding pool to do regional transportation planning which we would tap into in order to expand our plan and making sure we were accommodating some regional concerns.

Question: But not specifically for the Corvallis plan update?

Response: Not to underwrite it, yeah.

Comment: I guess what I am trying to get to is if we are going to provide specific recommendations seemingly one needs to be about expedited planning process so we could actually what's required to approve traffic safety, pedestrian safety and so forth.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): If I might add, I think from the University perspective it's also very important that we do this holistically because as we continue to grow and knowing what improvements do we want to make sure are reserved if you will, so we know that we'll know that we have the area to have those pedestrian corridors or we will have those different hubs—while all of us want to promote alternative transportation we also have to be cognitive of the fact that certain vehicles weigh a lot and when the wear and tear that they have on very old historic roads might also come at a very large cost to so we have to be very thoughtful about how we're weighing different options and where we are putting those options.

Comment (Mary): I would add to that as well is that there are a finite number of staff resources to take on projects and frankly with the effort that I anticipate to carry the parking recommendations through the community process that were going have to have and whatever support or not support for what the final plan will be and then implementing that final plan, we will basically be at July 2014.

Question: In your opinion is it customary to have an almost 2 decade long period of review or could the plan for both potentially for the University and the City be updated more frequently, like let's say in 10 years—what would be customary?

Response: Again I'll go back to our basic planning you know comprehensive planning on a City level we've been updating land development code. So we're almost the same time frame from done on our initial comprehensive plan, vision and comprehensive plan. And yeah I mean the goal would be a 7 to 10 year period.

Comment (Mary): But I will say the current Corvallis transportation plan assumed that it had a 20 year horizon.

Comment: And the same with the comprehensive plan, it would be nice if in a perfect world you'd have an update that evaluated that at least every 7 to 10 years then update without crying the blues here from a planning perspective of over a 10 year period when we were doing a lot of our basic plans and our neighborhood plans and north Corvallis, south Corvallis and west plan we were averaging probably averaging over \$100,000 a year in the planning budget for contractual services to augment staff and work through some planning. Next the proposal budget going to the budget commission has gone to the budget commission, it has zero right now. We're going to dependent on either grants to support to our planning activities in the near turn horizon or special allocations which can be done through the budget process for specific plans, but we don't have a program in place and haven't had for several years now to continually update plans. So it's just the reality we're dealing with right now.

Comment: And the University similar.

Comment (Eric Adams): I have something to point out to just in terms of the planning horizon for both the Comprehensive Plan and the TSP is that population of 62,000, we're still shy of that granted there is still 7 years left in planning document's timeframe, and at a roughly 1.5% to 2% per year growth rate, we could still get there. I think one of the questions that the community maybe needs to ask as part of the update to both

of those documents is how have those projections played out in terms of the contingent of the population that are students or non-students that are owning cars, and whether that's a greater percentage than was expected 20 years ago—but all of those projects that are laid out in the TSP are intended to accommodate that population of roughly 62,000 people by the end of the 20-year timeframe.

Comment: So we are on track from a transportation planning standpoint in our comprehensive plan, we're on track population wise but a lot of people know enough about the dynamics of that mix of demographics is much different than envisioned in the mid to late 90's.

Comment: And potentially the location as well has demographics.

Comment: Yeah, at that time, HP had 7,000 plus people and the University had 14,000 or 15,000.

Comment (Mary): Well, I think that's an important point with planning for a population—and maybe this is more important in terms of the utilities services, it's a population equivalent and so it's the demand on the system from the equivalent of what you would expect of 80,000 population. So say on the water side we could stay at 55,000 population and have two large food processing plants come in to town that would have the same demand of 80,000 population equivalent.

Question: So if you had a magic wand and based upon what you know and show some pressures you know in your everyday or have observed as it relates to easing traffic system safety through foot, community livability are there things that you might imagine that you would like to wave that wand address a list of one through five years?

Response (Mary): But I think it's also important to realize we are a community that is growing for a variety of reasons the campus population, businesses moving into different places and there's just a certain amount of change in the transportation system that comes with any growth so we want a community that's been at a certain level of population, there's a certain expectation for how people will use our transportation systems whether they are multi-modal or not and when a community grows those things are impacted in change. So I think that part of my magic wand would be to help folks understand it's not going to be the way it always was because we are not what we always were and so we need to plan for a future that accommodates where we think we're going in a way that is the safe as possible but people who may have been able to go down the street that is classified as a collector but it's never been really used a collector all the sudden can't do that anymore because business change and I think spruces up a perfect example of that outside of planning area but within the community where there's a certain—there used to be no traffic on spruce but because of the development of businesses along that area, because of influences on 9th street, it's used in our community and has changed and it will never go back to being the spruce it was. So part of it is just an understanding that we need to do the best we can with the resources that we have to meet the goals that I mentioned at the beginning of what I said but it is not going to be the Corvallis it was 10 years ago.

Question: Anything about neighborhood streets or neighborhood traffic that you might...?

Response (Mary): Well I think there are some things that we can do in conjunction with especially those areas around campus and it comes back to, I think Courtney mention it of when someone comes to town and they are unfamiliar with how our City is let alone the campus, if you don't come in on the south side and you come in on the north side it is very difficult to figure out how to get into campus unless you know where 15th street is and you cross over that way. So I think there might be some ways that we could look at Monroe or traffic patterns or streets that might help getting people out of those neighborhoods that are kind of to the southwest.

Comment: There has also been a plan for downtown with what's called way-finding program for a while that again looking for grants—but there would be a real opportunity I think to do that partnered with OSU and

at a community level. To get to major institutions focal point, downtown waterfront, hospitals, different parts of OSU, that would be a good project.

Comment (Mary): Well and I think part of that is working with ODOT as well and they have very specific signage regulations and I think we talked about that when we were talking about the parking but to the extent that we could get some changes.

Comment (Rebecca Houghtaling): I think I would like to see the University take the time to develop a holistic transportation plan that would support and accommodate the long term growth of the University in a way that doesn't compromise the University that we have—a beautiful University that has a unique features, it's a historic campus, but that comes at a responsibility to cost to maintain that whether it's the existing infrastructure or improve upon it—but really to maintain some of the best parts of the University like the pedestrian corridors and paths and looking at bicycle facilities and I think having a long term vision that can be implemented over time in a meaningful way is something that we have worked through the OUS bonding issues so that we can actually meet our obligations through the City of Corvallis because at the end of the day that's our responsibility as good stewards of the University is to meet our community obligations in good faith. So I think having a plan in place and helping the campus community understand how their needs fit into the long term stewardship picture for the University would be really critical.

Comment: Okay, so in our remaining 44 minutes, at our last meeting we reviewed the list of discussion topics, we have topics below each of them—let's go through these and identify any missing items, if there is any priorities in order associated with these and then let's talk with Eric and Ken to begin to understand to how we are going to gather the information to assess these.

Comment (Eric Adams): Under the traffic system functions we ended up with 4 items prioritized as listed here, this evening's discussion with Mary and Rebecca was in response to the first one; policy considerations for updates to the master plan and Corvallis Transportation master plan—I assume that following from that would be some sort of an assessment of discussion of potential neighborhood hotspots regarding traffic volume or congestion based on either empirical data or anecdotal or observations that workgroup members have made or through public testimony that we've received. Included in that group then as the third item was exploration of the “no net loss” policy for existing on campus parking supply, and then the last item being formulating some sort of recommendations around game day traffic—and we've talked a little bit about the concept of a no net loss policy for on campus parking—David Dodson when he was with us at the last meeting ran through some considerations for that. I am in the process of trying to connect with OSU athletics to have a discussion about game day traffic management and hopefully will be able to have one of their staff members come to a workgroup meeting to talk with you about that issue.

Question: Is number three, is it better under traffic systems or is it under parking management—where does it best reside?

Response: My notes had us moving it under traffic but I can see it for either one but I think we had it under parking management to being with.

Comment: What I think we heard tonight about traffic from Mary was traffic is broader than project collaboration boundaries while there's hotspots within them that are significant, do we have interest in examining traffic system as it relates to those areas outside of the collaboration project—for example signage

and Ken was examining—so my question is in our evaluation as it relates to some aspects of traffic we want to wander outside of the collaboration project area or some recommendations associated with that.

Comment: Well I'd say if there is a potential recommendation that impacts inside the collaboration area—even though it may be physically outside.

Question: Is there any other information that we need from the City or the University as far as the master plan and the transportation master plan update?

Response: The entire transportation plan is available through the City's website through their online archive, the chapters that I pulled down and included tonight in the packet, I was somewhat selective and just trying to give you background on the framework for the document and what its ultimate recommendations were, there's a lot more detail of information than what I included if you want to get into the specifics of the various improvement projects that are reviewed and approved annually as part of the capital improvement plan.

Question: Can you give any sense of the likelihood of a federal or state grant that the City would be eligible and would receive a time, any sense of likelihood?

Response: A better idea, later this week we've got the City's sponsored projects under what we've done is identified three projects for a pre-application, so applications are due mid-June I believe for the transportation management growth program. So I think it's likely the City will get some dollars from that—there's this project, the transportation plan update, there's also some work to do with regional housing and transportation housing or to get at the commute issues as well as well as some code issues. So it's hard to handicap it right now I think we will end up with some support from the state within the next biennial. Whether this is the one funded or not I think we will have a better sense what's going to meet their priorities.

Question: So you said we will have that in June?

Response: No, that's the deadline for applications we won't know the status until December, it's late. That's why as you look at dollars flowing it wouldn't be until sometime in 2014. I think later this calendar idea we will have an idea what project might be funded.

Question: Is there a likelihood that the full scope of what Mary described meeting around \$300,000 to create this plan, is that what the application will entail? Is it likely that it will be funded at that amount or some incremental amount less than that?

Response: That's not an unreasonable amount to have asked for funding for from that program because those are expensive projects and we aren't the only ones needing an update of TSP's.

Question: Would the application be enhanced by some sort of local match?

Response: We are required to match dollars and I don't know if you can buy into more in that one or not.

Question: Is there any incremental work that can happen before that time period—can this be broken into pieces where we can get something started before 2014?

Response: What you heard Mary saying, I've got the same issue on our general planning side is we've got obligations with this collaboration project that are taking the highest priority of our time between now and then in the next 2014, or mid 2014—so in our shop if we said we wanted to start updating the vision or the comprehensive plan we had X number of dollars that would be hard to get that started for another year and half, I mean 2014 is not that far off right now so I think it would be realistic to do anything before that point and time with the resources fiscal out of pocket dollars as well as staff.

Question: Did you say that the applications that are going to be put in for funding that the ones had not been decided on or they are?

Response: We have identified three projects through a pre-application stage and then we'll have to make a decision which ones we will take and spend staff time in the next month and a half.

Question: So there's a possibility that the transportation plan wouldn't be one of those three?

Response: It's a possibility, I think you need to handicap it first and decide where we're going to spend staff dollars and what might have the best chance to get funded through the system where we're going to spend time.

Question: So is there current information that we have had our access for traffic impacts beyond what the ODOT study provided that we could review or update?

Response (Eric Adams): So the City hasn't done active traffic counts on a broad scale in quite some time, any traffic counts that come in are typically associated with development applications to look at how they compare to trip generation and projections that were contemplated through the TSP. Obviously, because they are tied to development applications they are kind of sporadic, so the timeliness of them doesn't really allow for strong continuity. The set of data counts or traffic counts that were done by ODOT this last spring and fall – I included that map in the packet for tonight's meeting – those are probably the more comprehensive and recent set of counts that we have access to. CAMPO might have others, but based on reviewing information on their website, it doesn't look like it's any more thorough than we have there. Matthew do you know anything there given your involvement with ODOT's regional office or no? So I think that's probably the most recent and thorough data set that we have, and unfortunately it doesn't get beyond the neighborhood collector level classification, further down into local neighborhood street level. And even at the neighborhood collector level there sort of focused on those main corridors, Harrison, 29th, 35th, Western Blvd.

Question (Steve Clark): So would it be valuable if we will had some input from Ken's various staff as to what was anticipated in 1996 compared to actually what we've become, would that clearly share with us any information that would make it even more comparative if the plan is updated or density or demographics that have changed within the collaboration project which emphasizes what has created impacts and anticipate them which even more importantly emphasizes we got get an update—and I realize you are working to get the update then, but would it be at all valuable for people to see what was anticipated, could we even understand that?

Response: I don't know if I can answer that question Steve without thinking about what we had then and how much work that would be to do that comparison. That might be valuable data we might use in a grant application but maybe not for this committee.

Question: So could we, Eric, with this can you or someone provide some explanation of what we're seeing with that study?

Response: Yes we can do that, the traffic counts actually some of the data is available on the CAMPO website in an interactive map but it basically shows that for most of those intersections they are 48-hour volume counts at hour intervals and you can take those and do a total daily volume and compare that number to engineering standards given the functional classification of any of those roads how that compares to—is it above the traffic volume or below traffic volume that's anticipated for say an arterial street or neighborhood collector street—but that's level of service versus street cross-section improvements in terms of is it 2 lanes, is it 4 lanes, how much traffic is it serving. That doesn't necessarily correlate with people's perception of whether there is actual congestion or livability issues, and there is some discussion of that within chapter 11 of the TSP, that some of those things are hard to quantify, those are more qualitative measures of traffic and

they are going to vary from one persons to another. But we can at least have that quantitative barometer of how things compare, what the expectations were back in 96 compared to how they are performing now.

Question: Just a general question about this map, 48 hour volume points—that just means where measurements were taken?

Response: Right at each of those intersections—looking at the data sheets they have over a 48 hour period the number of cars that were traveling in an eastbound direction, a southbound direction.

Question: And those points were selected how?

Response: I am not certain it was ODOT's traffic count project count but it was basically done as an update to the regional transportation plan that both ODOT overseas is part of the state wide transportation plan, at the regional level in conjunction with the metropolitan planning organization. If the workgroup has interest we could probably talk with their staff and have someone come and give further explanation of why the data was collected and what they will be doing with it.

Question: Did they publish a report?

Response: On their website there's Destination 2035 that looks like it's generated in part by that data. I haven't looked it to closely yet.

Question: So there may be information in there that kind of correlates to this map?

Response: That's my sense and then if you go on this updated traffic counts link it actually takes you to an interactive map that shows you each of those locations, they are not exactly the same number that's shown on the figure that I gave you but the ones that are shown on here are also shown on that map. There's more points on the map that are shown on here, on the screen.

Comment: How about we move on, so on game day it sounds like we will have someone come in and talk about the map.

Comment: John Cheney and I have been playing phone tag here the last day or so.

Question: And the parking management, Ken, in terms of folks that we could have come and talk to us about the concept of the satellite facility that's been included with both some safety providing, density lighting, shuttle service, who would we invite to come talk to us about that?

Response: So I guess property management as part of campus operations, Nicole Neuschwander would be a good a resource she might have some experience with cost, I don't know. But then I guess if we are looking at the county then I guess we would have someone from the county we haven't really scoped out what the options are but it would seem like but by a whole proxy it seems like some of those might be county but that name has come up quite a bit.

Question: Could we identify someone from the county...

Response: In terms of using that particular facility, yeah we can figure out who that would be. I mean you've got a fair board what controls that, I am not sure who the first appropriate players are county, facility, staff or fairground staff.

Comment: And simply OSU risk management or somebody like that but we get to the idea of whether the county would be a partner and what it would require in terms of physical design and stuff like that and we will get to the risk management later.

Question (Gary Angelo): And who would that be from an OSU standpoint?

Response: Those agreement questions if we could have a—I am just theorizing if there was an area of the county fairgrounds that a fence could go around with lighting close enough for a shuttle to be able to get access to.

Question (Gary Angelo): I am just asking who ownership, whose responsibility would it be of the OSU community or you're the designated responsible person to identify a place?

Response: It could be something as far as the campus master plans consideration and that would identify the owner or the manager and there's lot of questions of what it would look like and how do you pay for it and stuff like that. Maybe we could just talk about the concept and maybe the county could respond to are there date limitations during the September 1st to June 20th to keep this from being possible from that location, maybe we start there. Then think to Gary's question who does what.

Comment (Gary Angelo): Well and also who to invite, you know we talked about it from an OSU perspective who should be on all the different considerations.

Question: Just to be clear, that would regard to the possibility of some facility people being on the OSU board?

Response (Gary Angelo): Some of them would own the project and they would responsible. So it would help bring to us what are the considerations that would have to be taken care of and should they educate us on.

Comment (Rainier Farmer): We really need to get a handle on the demand side of it as well, I mean we've gone with the assumption that if we built it they will come but I'd be interesting to try and find a formal peer institution but a similar institution that's implemented one of these and see what was done in terms of assessing.

Comment: Yeah when did they implement it, what point did they reach a utilization rate that was necessary because I am not sure we're at that point, especially until we implement some of the things we've talked about and the parking districts and the different rate structures on here.

Comment: And it could be that the beneficiary of that is not people presently or even trying to attract the campus but residents of the neighborhoods who have some connection to OSU but maybe entitled to think to park on the driveway or on the street, they become a beneficiary of having another choice.

Comment: I would say some place like Reser wouldn't fill that need for resident parking because they'd have to for game days and all those sorts of things. So it's sort of a re-motive for permit storage parking thing for residents in neighborhoods.

Comment: So maybe want to do is look at some of the opportunities and set some goals. We talked about potentially doing some focus groups or survey work on campus that could broadly ask some questions associated with satellite parking.

Question: Eric I don't recall if this was part of some of the benchmarking document that was put together seemingly eons ago but do you recall? What were the triggers, what was done?

Response (Eric Adams): I know that there was research that was done on that, and based on my recollection it was almost always the result of immediate capacity having been exhausted, not a desire to relocate parking capacity from the neighborhoods to some offsite or satellite area to free up capacity. I suppose either situation you are talking about some type of capacity being exhausted it's just a matter of whether that's on campus versus in the neighborhoods. We can certainly take a closer look at that.

Comment: So on the second item, I have a no car policy for Freshman. I started to do a little thumbnail evaluation of policy's that would be implementable or not by campus safety by housing and dining, what impact that might have on additions and other University experiences. There are about 20 to 25 University's that have this policy across the nation. Stanford probably gets 40,000 people applying as Freshman, about 4,000. So conversely Oregon State may have admission objection to—or the admissions office may have an objection to say Freshman from a state as rural as Oregon to not be able to bring their cars to campus. Now maybe there's a way to say you can bring it to Corvallis but you can't bring it to campus or potentially where

you park on campus. So I think there's a way over the next couple of weeks that we could have campus safety, housing and dining information about that for the committee impacts associated with this and if it's associated with it how you manage that—and then whether the University's experience is, I don't know is our work study person still working for us? Is that something they could help us with?

Response: Absolutely

Question: Is there private groups or profit making groups that might be interested in purchasing some land, and you'd be charging a very small parking fine?

Response: If we find out the county cannot...

Comment: I think it might be very interesting to see if there's any data on that or if anybody has any experience with that.

Comment: So like Carmike, in Portland some theaters do parking regulations because they don't typically have people using parking lots during the weekday for commuters and transit.

Question: So game day parking off campus, how can we evaluate this one?

Response: One of the things could be a survey to see what themes were relative to.

Comment: Another way might be to examine what other University's that have major events and find the best practices.

Comment: I don't think, when Eric finally connects with John Chaney, to include that in the conversation that were talking about traffic and see if they have future plans around that as well.

Comment: Could be from a Pac 12 that other facility managers like himself have talked about issues like this.

Comment: U of O manages game day parking quite a bit different they don't have it onsite.

Question: Before we move on to transportation management, any other thoughts about how to gather information especially with number two? Okay, how about number 1 on TDM?

Response: Courtney raised a point earlier about one of the new projects going in about there is no consideration of pedestrian crossing.

Comment: I'll need to come back and verify that or give a reasonable answer.

Comment: That was based on a review of a post annexation plan that calls for 1,008 bedrooms to be built and some adjustments to the general structure.

Question (Eric Adams): So you're talking about that there is no connection across here?

Response: Well yes the project is further south, there's nothing that gets them across the street close to campus. If they're thinking about it the bottom line is if they are thinking about it or saying that people are going to walk or bike, there's got to be better access and even to get across the street to be in the bike lane on 35th, is a challenge in dealing with the kind of traffic that's on 35th. A designated crossing would seem to make sense in the project, something on demand like we would do on 9th street for example and there is nothing showing at that point.

Question: Would it be a stretch to ask the people on that project who are developing it to maybe come in and maybe ask them what role could they play in making sure future residents ...

Response: I would be happy to do that, if they would be able to apply pressure I am not sure what would but I'll try.

Comment: I can provide information of what's been submitted and what we're reviewing and of course this one is subject whatever the rules are in place, we can obviously talk to them about good ideas, I don't the specifics and that's one to respond to but again we'll have to work within the standards from a requirement standpoint.

Comment: If I am a student and I am moving into this new development if I can get a packet of and hear the bike routes that have been designed for you that would be great.

Comment: There is good ideas and there is what we can require somewhere in between, so that's what I guess I need to find out.

Question: Would it be at all valuable for Brian to give us a 10 year horizon of anticipated construction on campus that is forecasted? For example know that the Austin Hall is being built, where it's being built but if we put the quad—see where it says Peavey fields and the area below would be probably the most opportunity area for construction of new—above Washington, right in that area there a little lower—potentially could be the next land development area for 25 years for classrooms. We know about the new dormitory that's being built, there's a chemistry and biological engineering building.

Response: If it's approved I'd imagine that it would go through a development process over the next 18 months.

Question: Do we have a perspective location?

Response: I've heard a couple.

Question: Would that be a benefit to folks to know where construction might occur on campus over the next decade?

Response: Yeah including any parking lots that are going to get parking consumed.

Question: Brandon, as far as number two parking spaces, parking safety. Rainier has said this for carpooling and rideshare, are you folks able to do that yourselves or provide some input on either?

Response: Yes, so I think what I might come back and do is we can talk amongst ourselves on campus a bit and maybe come back with a list of specifics or particular needs if there are any and finding gaps that we have and our ability to accomplish these things and see if the sort of scale that we are thinking about fits into the scale of activity the collaboration expects of us. I think that's it's important that all these things are quite scalable from a TDM standpoint and is our vision in align with what the collaboration expects.

Question: And is it sufficient to only focus on campus or is there anyone within the City with whom we work that would be a partner in that designation.

Response: Yeah I think certainly and particularly with the things that are listed in item two and three, so the bike parking that's sort of an on campus specific activity—and carpooling and ridesharing that really is more of a regional effort, so I think it depends on what the infrastructure needs are I think that makes sense, but it may be a different answer for both of them. In three with our carpooling and ridesharing system it really is administered by regional Cascades council governments. We can bring them in if that's helpful.

Question: And then Jeff do you think the collaboration with Benton Center that there would be any?

Response: We're just beginning the process now of commission for parking study, so we would be I think in terms of our personnel that could contribute to that conversation and what we know would be worse and unable to identify difficulties, I don't know if we could add much value to that conversation.

Question: Can you think of anything as far as the community and the MPO or the City?

Comment (Eric Adams): Regarding the bicycle parking, at the last utilization survey study, was that done last fall is that right? So fairly recent and for our purposes and Rebecca would have that information.

Comment: So Rebecca spoke eloquently about the concept of making these things all related on campus and with the campus master plan. I think it would be good for Brian or David or Rebecca to come back one more time. The last meeting maybe after we go through all of these things we could say here is where we are headed, we've all worked a lot and I am not making a lot of sense but what I am suggesting is, is there an

opportunity based upon what we've learned over the next several weeks to even emphasize more within the campus master planning process.

Comment: Well I think that obviously in a lot of the conversations with the City and the campus community a lot of different goals and strategies that we're really trying to sort through and I think having the additional discussion (cannot hear 1:55:31-1:55:43). I mean it's interesting I heard the question about the southern development as we had some conversations with that developer, a conference call with the developer out on campus crest and through the course OSU has lent (Cannot Hear). So how kind of to Ken's earlier point whatever requirements the City has currently in terms of the land development code with regards to that southern property and also the campus crest property out on Harrison that's what we are going to be considering and talking about trying to figure out how any of those individuals that are moving into those two developments, how they are going to get from where they are to the core of campus community.

Comment: So as it relates to transportation system safety, we talked with Steve Mitchel OSP Oregon state police and Jack Rodgers campus safety about pedestrian safety, pathway safety and bicycle safety, would it valuable to invite those folks to come address what steps they presently engage what steps they might see broadly if we're going to place emphasis on not driving to campus or leaving your car at a satellite location for example to get them to offer their considerations as far as how do we elevate pathway safety not only on campus but around the campus community and Corvallis.

Comment: I think they could speak to certainly the enforcement aspect of it and to a maybe a lesser extent the education programs, number two I don't think they would speak to—I think Brian has identified it in terms of what infrastructure is really necessary to support this new development.

Question: Sidewalks and crossings would be part of this infrastructure?

Response: Yeah or paths to get people to a safer crossing point or whatever I think that's one.

Question: Would we want neighborhood organization representatives to talk about what they'd like to see in their neighborhoods as far as pathways or signage or something to facilitate walking and biking through neighborhoods instead of parking?

Response: It certainly would be a useful discussion and to do some surveying to ask those kinds of questions other than some of the ones we already got on their online survey. I guess my other question on the safety, were we also including this piece on campus nighttime safety and remote parking lots because I am just wondering on what number are we including that and who would be addressing that?

Response: Certainly number one and potentially number two in terms of...

Comment: I am just going back to what Rainer said because of the perception that it's not safe then what is it that would make people feel safe.

Comment: That might be survey data or best practices from other communities.

Comment: So if we do other upcoming surveys among those questions...

Comment: Which would be what would enhance the feeling of safety going to the parking garage, on 30th.

Comment: Yeah I think it's kind of a joint ownership of the corridor project but we would certainly want the new parking development and traffic patterns we have on campus.

Comment: If we're going to do anything like neighborhood coordinated focus groups that might be a question that could be worked into or some questions to ask.

Comment: One way to do the neighborhood focus groups is to plan a meeting in the neighborhood wherever that might be and around the topic of neighborhood safety as far as walking, biking and skateboarding.

Comment: Keep in mind that on the City level we have a bike Ped commission and we have a bike ped coordinator and public works so we have resources.

Question: So we could ask them to come?

Response: Yeah I think working through Mary, but Greg Wilson is the bike ped coordinator and there's a very engaged longtime bike ped commission that's very enthusiastic.

Question: Under education programs, Eric do you remember what are the best practices the universities—were there any things researched related to education programs that other universities or communities utilize that we could capture or steal from?

Response: I don't recall, I can't remember off the top of my head but I am almost certain that there must be.

Comment: But we've had a little bit work on the committee the brand new chairs the alternative transportation advisory committee with public safety on, there's a video they were working on so there is a few and I don't know of public safety.

Question: Should we discuss the metrics that we want to begin assessing OSP?

Response: That should tie into the recommendations that we've already made.

Comment: So we're looking at both current and previous recommendations, we want metrics around all of them.

Comment: And if we could also just kind of check off that we've already developed a recommendation because we did use some metrics at least in terms of the goal setting—but for those who did we probably already did and we feel that those are valid metrics.

Comment: Some of those would be on the matrix.

Comment: That's easy to do.

Comment: Good for the night.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

February 18, 2013

A motion was made to approve and seconded with the following amendment:

- The February 18th minutes was submitted

Majority approved; none opposed. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on May 8, 2013, at Osborn Aquatic Center.